

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **05 October 2009**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288 hereinafter “Reed”), Bischoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,377 hereinafter “Bischoff”), and Zintel (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,004, hereinafter “Zintel”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 as being unpatentable over Reed in view of Bischoff and Zintel. Applicant respectfully disagrees because neither Reed nor Zintel discloses a universal data transfer interface and a DTSO comprising **object-oriented mobile code** that can be transmitted to and executed on a plurality of component to facilitate file access and printing without, any knowledge of the components’ file system protocols or printer domain protocols, prior to initiating a data transfer.

Examiner states that Reed does not disclose a universal data transfer interface which does not have a priori knowledge of the components’ file system protocols or printer domain protocols, wherein the data object controls the universal data transfer interface.

In rejecting the claimed universal data transfer interface, Examiner states that Zintel discloses a universal plug and play interface (UPnP) “that enables any networked device to initiate a communication with any other networked device, without having established a prior relationship” (see Zintel, column 5, lines 57-62). However, the universal plug and play interface is fundamentally different from the claimed universal data transfer interface, because UPnP uses **XML and accompanying XSL** for device description, and accesses file systems using URL links (see Zintel, column 48, lines 42-50, and column 25, lines 57-58). In contrast, the claimed universal data transfer interface is based on **object-oriented mobile code** which has no a priori knowledge of the components’ file system

protocols or printer domain protocols (see paragraphs [0018] and [0035] of the instant application). XML data and XSL style sheets used in Zintel are **NOT** object-oriented mobile code because they cannot be transmitted to and executed on other components to facilitate file system access and printing.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention involve a universal data transfer interface and a DTSO comprising object-oriented mobile code, which can be transmitted to and executed on the plurality of component to facilitate file access and printing without knowledge of the components' file system protocols or printer domain protocols, prior to initiating a data transfer (see instant application, paragraphs [0035]). Nothing within Reed or Bischoff, suggests or implies a universal data transfer interface or a DTSO that include **object-oriented mobile code** that can be transmitted to and executed on a plurality of component to facilitate file access and printing without knowledge of the components' domain specific file system domain or printer domain protocols prior to initiating a data transfer.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention involve a universal data transfer interface and a DTSO that can be transmitted to and executed on the plurality of component to facilitate file access and printing without knowledge of the components' file system protocols or printer domain protocols, prior to initiating a data transfer. These amendments find support in instant application, paragraphs [0018] and [0035]. No new matter has been added. Applicant has also cancelled claims 5, 16, and 27 without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-4 and 6-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-11, which depend upon claim 8, claims 14-15 and 17-18, which depend upon claim 12, claims 20-22, which depend upon claim 19, claims 25-26 and 28-29, which depend upon claim 23, and claims 31-33, which depend upon claim 30, are for the

same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 18 December 2009

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com